REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application in view of the following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 16, 17, 19-20, 22-24, 27-34 and 36-40 are pending in this application. Claims 5-6, 25 and 26 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 15, 18, 21 and 35 have been canceled.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,432,850 to Takagi et al. ("Takagi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,744,236 to Rohrbach et al. ("Rohrbach")

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that: "considering the substantially identical fabric taught by the applied prior art, compared to the claimed fabric, it appears that the fabric could be used as claimed." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that Takagi merely relates to garment fabrics for use in dust proof clothes and such fabrics are not capable of being used as a conductive engineered fabric for use in making nonwoven textiles in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes. This is due to the fact that garment fabrics produced with fibers having a fineness as small as 0.1-5 denier (Takagi's entire disclosure) are just not suitable to withstand the pressure and load experienced by engineered fabrics used in processes such as airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding process. The Examiner is misinterpreting Takagi by asserting that his fabric could be used as claimed.

As to Rohrbach, it is directed to a nonwoven filter media. *Rohrbach*, Abstract. Accordingly, both Takagi and Rohrbach do not even remotely relate to engineered fabrics. Specifically, Takagi and Rohrbach are directed to a conductive cloth or garment and hollow fibers filled with solid carbon particles for use in nonwoven filter media respectively, and not to an industrial or engineered fabric as recited in the instant claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the relied upon portions of Takagi and Rohrbach, considered either alone or in combination. Since independent claim 24 is similar or somewhat similar in scope to claim 1, it is also patentable, and therefore should be allowed.

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31-34, 36, 37, 39-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Takagi in view of Rohrbach in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,842,465 to Sillaots et al. ("Sillaots").

Instant claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> "A conductive engineered fabric used in making nonwoven textiles **in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes** comprising **a plurality of polymeric filaments having one or more C-shaped grooves with a mouth having a width less than the width of a central portion of the groove formed therein** ..." (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, the instant invention is directed to engineered fabrics used in making nonwoven textiles, specifically, in the airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes and the filaments that are used to construct these engineered fabrics.

Sillaots, relates to an apparatus for forming a fibrous lap from webs, including a conveyor to deliver the webs, and a mechanism to lay the webs onto a conveyer withdrawing the ready lap. From Sillaots' disclosure it is clear that it is directed to an apparatus for use in a process such as carding, specifically as a cross-lapping machine. A person of ordinary skill in the art well

recognizes the fact that a cross-lapping machine is not used in airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes recited in the instant claims. The instant claims are specifically related to these processes, because there is a need for an engineered fabric that could dissipate static charge that is developed between the fibers of the fibrous web when they are being "formed" on the engineered fabric. Sillaots' belt merely transports a nonwoven web in a certain fashion, after the web is already formed. There is no need for "static dissipation" in Sillaots.

Merely because Sillaots discloses that the belt used on the machine requires having physical and mechanical properties such as use of antistatic plastic to make the belt, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Takagi, which relates to garment fabrics, for a use in an industrial machine.

The Examiner's attention is directed towards the following websites, which clearly show the purpose or use of a cross-lapping machine in the industry. A person of ordinary skill in the art well recognizes the fact that a cross-lapping machine is not used in airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes as recited in the instant claims.

www.habisat.com for types of belts use in this industry and their differences

www.dilo.de for devices used in cross-lapping and diagrams depicting cross-lapping machines, and

www.ramicon-fiberlok.com for a video showing a cross-lapper belt in motion.

Applicants submit that conveyer belts used on such devices are impermeable and coated. However, it is well known that fabrics used in airlaid, meltblown or spunbonding processes must be permeable to function in their intended use. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not look to the belt of Sillaots for applications involving the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not rendered obvious over Takagi, Rohrbach and/or Silloats. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 24 patentably distinguish over Takagi, Rohrbach and Silloats, either alone or in combination because the relied upon portions of the cited references fail to teach each and every limitation of claims 1 and 24 or motivate a person skilled in the art to modify or combine the references to practice the claimed invention.

Therefore, claims 1 and 24 are allowable. Further, claims 2-4, 7-14, 16, 17, 19-23 and 39, which depend from claim 1, and claims 27-34, 36-38 and 40, which depend from claim 24, are also allowable.

Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is submitted that the instant claims should be allowed and that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections, and prompt issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
Telephone: (212) 588-0800
Facsimile: (212) 588-0500